

REMARKS

Applicant's remarks are preceded by quotations of the related comments of the examiner, in small, boldface type.

3. Claims 15-17 and 26-35 are rejected under 35 U. S. C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmitt et al. [US 6,088,222] in view of Gotzfried et al. [US 6,236,570].

Regarding claims 15 and 27-35, Schmitt et al. disclose a disk drive assembly including an electromagnetic interference shield (figures 4b and 5) comprising:

- a frontal plate having a plurality of openings therethrough (figure 5);
- a side panel (figure 5) perpendicular to the frontal plate and extending rearwardly thereof; and
- at least one electrically conductive resilient spring finger clip (figure 5) protruding in a lateral direction from the side panel; and
- the shield being disposed between the disk drive carrier and a second disk (figure 3).

Schmitt et al. disclose the instant claimed invention except for the shield being disposed between a latching mechanism and a base of a disk drive carrier.

Gotzfried et al. disclose a disk drive carrier (1) having a base (figure I), a latching mechanism (3, 4) and a shield member (2) disposed between the latching member and the base (figure I).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to use the shield/latch mounting design of Gotzfried et al. with the disk drive of Schmitt et al., for the purpose of facilitating removal of the 'disk drive from the housing.

Applicant has amended claim 15. Schmitt and Gotzfried do not disclose or suggest an electromagnetic interference shield having "an electrically conductive finger clip housed in the side panel and protruding in a lateral direction from the side panel, the clip having a first end, a second end, and an intermediate portion and a length, the first end being formed to secure the clip to the side panel and the intermediate portion forming an angle so that the apex of the angle protrudes in the lateral direction and the length of the clip being oriented along the rearwardly direction" as recited in amended claim 15.

Schmitt only discloses an EMI shield 430 having integrally formed fingers 434 with a radiused profile but does not disclose or suggest an intermediate portion forming an angle that protrudes in a lateral direction from a side panel. (See Figs. 4C and 4D, col. 7, line 48 to col. 8, line 13.) Nor does Schmitt disclose or suggest fingers 434 have a first end formed to secure fingers 434 to a side panel.

Gotzfried merely discloses a front shielding plate 2 having contact humps 29, 30 "formed at an upper edge 27 and a lower edge 28 of the front shielding plate 2," but does not disclose or suggest humps 29, 30 have an intermediate portion forming an angle that protrudes in the lateral direction or a first end formed to secure humps 29, 30 to a side panel. (col. 3, lines 58-59.)

Claims 16, 17, 22, 23, 25, and 26 are dependent on amended claim 15 and patentable for at least the same reasons.

5. Claim 24-25 are rejected under 35 U. S. C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmitt et al. in view of Gotzfried et al. and Anderson et al.

Regarding claim 24, Schmitt et al. disclose a disk drive assembly including an electromagnetic interference shield (figures 4b-d and 5) comprising:

-a frontal plate having top and bottom edges and plurality of openings therethrough (figure 5);

-a side panel (figure 5) having a top edge and a bottom edge and being connected at a substantially right angle to the frontal plate and extending rearwardly thereof;

-the upper and lower plates of the shield being configured to permit the shield to be mounted to the carrier base (column 7, lines 48-52);

-at least one electrically conductive resilient spring finger clip (figure 5) protruding in a lateral direction from the side panel; and

-the shield being disposed between the disk drive carrier and a second disk (figure 3).

Schmitt et al. disclose the instant claimed invention except for the shield being formed of steel and disposed between a latching mechanism and a base of a disk drive carrier.

Gotzfried et al. disclose a disk drive carrier (1) having a base (figure I), a latching mechanism (3,4) and a shield member (2) disposed between the latching member and the base (figure I).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to use the shield/latch mounting design of Gotzfried et al. with the disk drive of Schmitt et al., for the purpose of facilitating removal of the disk drive from the housing.

Official notice is taken to the effect that it is well known to use steel for making the shield in order to prevent electromagnetic interference.

Anderson et al. disclose an EMI shielding plate (40) having upper and lower plates extending from the top and bottom edges of a frontal panel (figure 3).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to add the lower plate to the frontal plate of Schmitt et al. in view of Gotzfried et al., as suggested by Anderson et al., for the purpose of providing frontal shielding structure.

Applicant has amended claim 24. Schmitt, Gotzfried, and Anderson do not disclose or suggest "an electrically conductive finger clip housed in the side panel and protruding in a lateral direction from the side panel, the clip having a first end, a second end, and an intermediate portion and a length, the first end being formed to secure the clip to the side panel and the intermediate portion forming an angle so that the apex of the angle protrudes in the lateral direction and the length of the clip being oriented along the rearwardly direction" as recited in amended claim 24.

As discussed above, regarding amended claim 15, Schmitt and Gotzfried do not disclose or suggest the finger clip recited in amended claim 24. Anderson discloses "[a] plurality of resilient EMC clips 44 attach[ed] to the edges of shielding 40 and bear[ing] upon the edges of immediately adjacent shielding 40 on adjoining storage assemblies 20." (Fig. 3; col. 4, lines 18-22.) Clips 44 are shown in Fig. 3 having a length oriented along the height of shielding 40 but Anderson does not disclose or suggest the length of clips 44 may be oriented along a rearwardly direction.

The fact that the applicant has responded to certain positions taken by the examiner does not constitute a concession with respect to any positions of the examiner to which the applicant has not explicitly responded. The fact that the applicant has focused on certain reasons for

Applicant : Kevin G. Jiang
Serial No. : 10/006,519
Filed : December 3, 2001
Page : 9 of 9


Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-003003 / P6716D2

patentability of the claims does not constitute a concession that there are not other good reasons why the claims are patentable.

Applicant asks that all claims be allowed. Enclosed is a \$110 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/11/04



Matthew B. Loftus
Reg. No. 51,963

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

20729646.doc